

Pal 2-01 US/USSR

CHICAGO TRIBUNE

FEB 8 1964

Org 1 Institute for Defense Analyses

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON By Walter Trohan CHIEF OF CHICAGO TRIBUNE'S WASHINGTON BUREAU	U. S. Soft Line on Russia Believed Work of Eggheads Chicago Tribune Copyright 1964
--	---

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7—Signals for the shift in American policy from a hard to a soft line on communist Russia appear to have been called by an egg-head organization. The new strategy of togetherness was outlined in the so-called Phoenix study of the Institute for Defense Analyses, a private research group established by a \$500,000 "loan" from the Ford Foundation, which has become a revolving fund.

The Phoenix study consists of five papers, whose thesis is the United States and Soviet Russia "combined have for all practical purposes a near monopoly of force in the world" and it is "not nearly so far fetched to conceive of their being used in a mutually supporting fashion to maintain the peace of the world."



Trohan

The study, which called for taking the initial steps to bring about Russo-American cooperation, was made available to President Kennedy before he made his speech last June at American university. In outlining a "strategy for peace," based on relaxation of the cold war, President Kennedy appears to have followed many of the Phoenix study recommendations. One paper study by Vincent P. Rock said:

"If the President decided that a reciprocated cut in the defense percentage of the gross national product were desirable, he would first set up highly reliable and possibly complex lines of communication with the Soviet Union to explain his proposed actions as moves made from strength."

"Then he might advocate a further United States tax cut, thereby encouraging the economy-minded to seek a tax cut in defense expenditures—the obvious candidate for decreases. Then military analysis could establish the mix of expenditures at the lower level. The Soviets would be given unpublicized opportunities to indicate their response, and thereby encourage or discourage the President's proposed plan of action."

Johnson Takes Up Where Kennedy Left Off

LINES of communication were established, including the Moscow-Washington "hot" line. The nuclear test ban treaty was negotiated. President Johnson has picked up where Kennedy left off, continuing communications and cutting defense spending.

The Phoenix study states in the first of its papers:

"Survival is an interest shared by the United States and the Soviet Union. Since the survival of each is in the hands of the other, neither is sure of what is necessary for it to survive . . . There remains the possibility of creating a substantial cross nation diffusion of interest . . . material progress brings diversity and with it new possibilities for weaving a web of interdependence across national lines."

The study condemns the policy of "maximum demand" as an arms control negotiations technique, insisting that instead of making a maximum demand and retreating from that position, the United States "try the experiment of carefully determining minimum conditions, presenting them to the Soviets on a 'take it or leave it' basis with the clear message they constitute the first and final demands, and then holding the conditions against all pressures." This technique, which amounts to giving the Russians what they want, was employed in the negotiations of the nuclear test ban treaty, under which the United States surrendered on its traditional demand for inspections.

Study Opposes U. S. Reliance on Strength

THE Phoenix study suggests that the United States drop its historical reliance on strength, saying: "The overwhelming reliance on military strength for the exercise of power and influence limits its ability to place the necessary foundations for a world community."

Further, the study makes an astounding evaluation under which the United States and Soviet Russia equally share guilt for world tension because neither "is wholly committed to a view of a world community which provides an acceptable place for the other."

This influential report was published in a limited edition of 300 copies at a cost of \$78,600. The cost is borne by the taxpayers because the institute was launched with a grant from the tax exempt foundation and because it does some 10 million dollars worth of work for the defense department yearly.

The institute, which is headed by Richard M. Bissell, a former central intelligence agency official, has not, thus far, advocated a cut in its share of the taxpayer's pie in its advocacy of cutting down on defense spending.